

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**

224



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,580	09/21/2001	Atsushi Kaneko	005306.P042	5430

7590

08/04/2004

Lance A. Termes  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
Seventh Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

VO, TED T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/960,580	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KANEKO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ted T. Vo	<b>Art Unit</b> 2122	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *                                                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/04/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 9/21//2001.

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robinson et al., "New Approaches to Creating and Testing Internationalized Software", 11-1998.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification.

As per Claim 1: Robinson discloses: "*A method, comprising:*

*integrating a pseudo localization process with a build process, wherein the pseudo localization process includes at least one pseudo localization utility application (See Page 31, Figure 2; see page 30, Figure 1, "English", "French": at least one pseudo localization utility application);*

*executing the at least one pseudo localization utility application to generate pseudo-translated locale-dependant code, wherein executing the at least one pseudo localization utility application includes:*

*(a) retrieving locale-dependant code from at least one storage location (See Figure 1, Solution 1 inputted into Traditional Process Flow);*

Art Unit: 2122

*(b) altering an appearance of the locale-dependant code (See Figure 1, the box "Translate the Message Catalog into Multiple Languages", "Test I18N code Using Default Message Catalog": locale-dependant code, See Figures 4 and 5, pages 32 and 33, respectively: altering an appearance; see page 32, Solution 1); and*

*(c) storing the altered locale-dependant code in at least one second storage location (See Figure 1, the box "Test I18N code Using Translated Message Catalog": in at least one second storage location); and generating a pseudo-language build with the pseudo-translated locale-dependant code." (See Figure 5: a pseudo-language build, see page 32, Solution 1).*

As per Claim 2: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, further comprising:

*testing the pseudo-language build; and*

*identifying at least one internationalization bug."* (See page 30, right column, Process Flow: indentations 2 and 3).

As per Claim 3: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 2, wherein the internationalization bug comprises a hard-coded string, a hard-coded format, or a hard-coded reference to a translation" (See page 33, left column, Challenge 2).

As per Claim 4: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 2, wherein identifying the at least one internationalization bug comprises discovering unaltered locale-dependant code in the user-interface" (See page 33, right column, Challenge 3, the last 3 steps).

As per Claim 5: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein altering the appearance of the locale-dependant code comprises adding at least one prefix character to the locale-dependant code" (See page 34, Figures 6 and 7: discussing a Japanese preceding string).

As per Claim 6: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 5, wherein the at least one prefix character comprises at least one multi-byte character" (See page 34, Figures 6 and 7: a Japanese character comprises at least one multi-byte character).

As per Claim 7: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 5, wherein the at least one prefix character comprises at least one right-to-left character" (See page 34: Solution 3: language independent test, target

Art Unit: 2122

language: Noted that a target language depends on its writing style: some target language having writing style from right to left).

As per Claim 8: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 5, wherein the at least one prefix character comprises a prefix string including at least one multi-byte character and at least one right-to-left character" (See rationale of Claim 7 and 8 above).

As per Claim 9: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one server message specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one server message" (See page 33, right column, Challenge 3, the last 3 steps, and referring to "test case").

As per Claim 10: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one repository string specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one repository string" (See page 30, Figure 1: "Help", "Aide").

As per Claim 11: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one resource file specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one resource file" (See page 30, Figure 1: "Help menu" in English and French).

As per Claim 12: Robinson discloses: "*The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one utility application (Figures 8 and 9: HTML version) capable of retrieving or altering at least one element of user-interface code of a type selected from a group, including; a server message, a repository string, a static UI file, and a seed data file*" (Discussed in Figure 2; and see Figures 7 and 8, buttons in English and Japanese characters).

As per Claim 13: Robinson discloses: "*The method of Claim 1, wherein the build process comprises a database build process (Figure 2), the at least One pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one seed data file specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one seed data file*" (See page 35, Figures 8 and 9: "HTML version of an English help page and HTML version of a Japanese Help page).

As per Claim 14: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the build process comprises a software build process" (Figure 2; and particularly, page 30: "Developing Internationalized Software").

Art Unit: 2122

As per Claims 15-28: See rationale respectively of Claims 1 to 14 above,

As per Claims 29-39: See rationale respectively of Claim 1, 5-14 above.

**Conclusion**

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Mullaney**, US No. 5,917,484, discloses multilingual configuration system.

**Garcia et al.**, "A Three-layer DSS Based on Multi-Objective Value Analysis for Internationalization of Software Products and Services", discloses a decision support system for assisting and enhancing software products in global market.

**Kokkotos et al.**, "An Architecture for Designing Internationalized Software", discloses a system for localization/internationalization that provides an end-user with modification abilities.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM ET. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

The fax phone numbers:

(703) 872-9306 (for formal communication intended for entry);

(703) 746-5429 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TED T. VO

Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2122  
July 16, 2004